

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Г	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/727,044	12/04/2003	Ryuji Yamamoto	Q73370	4853
	23373	7590 02/03/2006		EXAMINER	
		MION, PLLC		MARCHESCHI, MICHAEL A	
	2100 PENNSY SUITE 800	/LVANIA AVENUE, N.	W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037		1755	
		•			

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				F. /		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	——————————————————————————————————————		
		10/727,044	YAMAMOTO ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michael A. Marcheschi	1755			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period varie to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be found and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed m the mailing date of this communic IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 No.	<u>ovember 2005</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	453 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-10 and 17-21</u> is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>11-16</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	e withdrawn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	• •		
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) ⊠ None of: 1. ☑ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1755

Applicants are reminded that the Japanese priority document has not been received.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 11-16 in the reply filed on 11/21/05 is acknowledged.

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 11-16 are indefinite because they depend on a non elected claim.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/727,044 Page 3

Art Unit: 1755

Claims 11-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated Hu et al. (448).

Hu et al. teaches in section [0019], [0089], [0093], [0094], [0098], [0101], [0105] and figure 4 (shows that he article is circular), an article comprising a conductive fiber, a conductive fillers (as is evident from the limitation "or combinations thereof") and a bonding agent (i.e. matrix). The conductive fiber includes carbon fibers that are hollow and can have a diameter of 0.1 micron. As can be seen from the length and diameter (0.1) of the broad fiber dimensions, the aspect ratio, when calculated, can be within the claimed range. Section [0090] implies that the fiber has a multilayer structure. The conductive fillers include conductive particles (i.e. conductive ceramic particles-see section [0098]) and the conductive ceramic particles are known to include titanium carbide, tungsten carbide, etc-see section [0094] (i.e. these are abrasives).

With respect to claims 12, 13, 14 and 16, applicants are claiming a material and the reference teaches a material which is based on the claimed composite. In view of this, the claimed invention is anticipated by the reference. With respect to claim 11, since the reference teaches a composite which is circular in structure (see figure 4) and a grinding wheel is circular, no distinction is seen to exist. This is also apparent because no additional structure is defined by the instant claim. In addition, applicants are claiming a "material" which the intended use does not carry any weight to the composition (see In re Thuau 57 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1942). Any material possesses a property such that it may be used for a purpose. Finally, irrespective of what the material is called, the composition and structure (circular) are the same, thus no distinction is seen to exist.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hu et al. (448).

Application/Control Number: 10/727,044

Art Unit: 1755

In addition to the above teachings, the reference teaches an amount for the fibers in section [0105] and although this amount is defined in weight percent, it is the examiners position that when said amount is converted to volume percent, it broadly reads on the claimed amount.

In view of the teachings as set forth above, it is the examiners position that the references reasonably teach or suggest the limitations of the rejected claims.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. In re Opprecht 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (CAFC 1989); In re Bode USPQ 12; In re Lamberti 192 USPQ 278; In re Bozek 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); In re Van Mater 144 USPQ 421; In re Jacoby 135 USPQ 317; In re LeGrice 133 USPQ 365; In re Preda 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968). In addition, "A reference can be used for all it realistically teaches and is not limited to the disclosure in its preferred embodiments" See In re Van Marter, 144 USPQ 421.

Applicants use process limitations to define the product and "product-by-process" (molding) claims do not patentably distinguish the product even though made by a different process. *In re Thorpe* 227 USPQ 964.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Marcheschi whose telephone number is (571) 272-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/727,044

Art Unit: 1755

1/06 MM Michael A Marcheschi Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755